

REMARKS

STATUS OF THE CLAIMS

In accordance with the foregoing, claims 1, 5, 11 and 15 have been amended. Claims 1-20 are pending and under consideration.

No new matter is being presented, and approval of the amended claims is respectfully requested.

EXAMINER INTERVIEW

A telephonic interview with the Examiner was conducted on November 2, 2005, in which the Examiner stated the cited references do not appear to teach or suggest that each cache memory section includes a power control unit, as disclosed by the present invention. In contrast, the cited references teach a single centralized power control unit.

Accordingly, independent claims 1, 5, 11 and 15 are amended herein to recite consumption power mode control units in number n, individually controlling each cache memory section.

REJECTIONS OF CLAIMS 1-20 FOR OBVIOUSNESS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103(a) AS BEING UNPATENTABLE OVER FARRELL (U.S. PATENT NO. 5,014,195) IN VIEW OF ALBONESI (DAVID H. ALBONESI, "SELECTIVE CACHE WAYS: ON-DEMAND RESOURCE ALLOCATION," 1999)

The rejections of claims 1-20 are respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested.

As stated above, independent claims 1, 5, 11 and 15 are amended herein to recite consumption power mode control units in number n, individually controlling each cache memory section.

Since, in the present invention, each cache memory section has an individual consumption power mode control unit, the entire power consumption can be reduced by limiting the number of cache memories that are turned on (and, therefore, consuming electric power). (See page 22, lines 11-22 and page 24, line 21 to page 25, line 7 of the Specification). Furthermore, the cache memories can be turned on or off simultaneously (and, therefore, quickly) because each of the consumption power mode control units controls each of the cache memories in parallel. Moreover, operational delay can be reduced because each of the consumption power mode control units can be arranged near its respective cache memory

section.

As the Examiner stated in the interview of November 2, 2005, the cited references fail to teach or suggest the features described above. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that independent claims 1, 5, 11 and 15 patentably distinguish over the prior art.

Claims 2-4 depend from claim 1, claims 6-10 depend from claim 5, claims 12-14 depend from claim 11 and claims 16-20 depend from claim 15. Dependent claims 2-4, 6-10, 12-14 and 16-20 inherit the patentable recitations of their respective base claims and, thus, it is respectfully submitted that claims 2-4, 6-10, 12-14 and 16-20 also patentably distinguish over the prior art.

CONCLUSION

In accordance with the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that all outstanding objections and rejections have been overcome and/or rendered moot. Further, all pending claims patentably distinguish over the prior art. There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

If there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date:

January 3, 2006

By:

David M. Pitcher
David M. Pitcher
Registration No. 25,908

1201 New York Ave, N.W., Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501